(OTAM, 33/Bahar 2013), (43-62)

Religious Puritans in Sarajevo in the 18th Century[1]

18. Yüzyıl Saraybosna'sında Kadızâdeliler

Kerima Filan[*]

Abstract

The paper studies the notes from Mulla Mustafa Basheski's *mecmua* in which he recorded the presence of religious Puritans in the City of Sarajevo (*medîne-i Saraybosna*) in the second half of the eighteenth century. As this *mecmua* is of a diary type for the fact that the writer ended each of his notes by dating the event dealt with in it, we can see that the religious Puritans were influential both in religious and social life in Sarajevo from 1766-1767 until the end of the eighteenth century. Mulla Mustafa Basheski called them *muteassibs*, *kadizadelis* and *munkirs*. He related the appearance of the religious Puritans in Sarajevo to the arrival in the City of the person he mentioned under the name of Vaiz of Amasia (*Amasyalı Vâiz*). Vaiz was a teacher - muderis in a Sarajevo madrasah and preacher who "in each of his sermons criticised sufis, sheiks, kadis, pashas". Several notes in the *mecmua* witness to the direct conflicts between the religious Puritans and sufis. Some notes reveal efforts of the Puritans to influence life of the overall community in the way that twice in the span of twenty years they arranged for a ban on the performance of acrobats who came to Sarajevo to entertain people with their skills.

Keywords: Sarajevo, the eighteenth century, religious Puritans, sufis

Özet

Bu makalede Molla Mustafa Başeski tarafından kaleme alınmış mecmuada yer alan ve 18. yüzyılın ikinci yarısında Saraybosna'da (*medîne-i Saraybosna*) kadızâdelilerin bulunmalarından bahseden kayıtlar ele alınmıştır. Kayıtlarının konusu olan olay ve durumların tarihlerini düzenli olarak yazmış olan Molla Mustafa, mecmuasına bir çeşit "günlük" niteliğini kazandırmıştır. Bu hususa dayanarak Saraybosna'nın dinî ve

---

[1] A version of this paper was published in the Bosnian language: Kerima Filan, Sufije i kadizadelije u osmanskom Sarajevu [Sufis and Kadizadelis in Ottoman Sarajevo], *Anali Gazi Husrev-begove biblioteke*, 29-30, Sarajevo, 2009, p. 163-186.

[*] *Prof. Dr., University of Sarajevo, Department of Oriental Philology.*

toplumsal hayatında kadızâdelilerin 1766-1767 yılından itibaren 18. yüzyılın sonuna kadar etkili oldukları sonucuna varmak mümkündür. Molla Mustafa Başeski kendileri için *müteassıb*, *kadızâdeliler*, *münkirler* gibi ifadeleri kullanmıştır. Saraybosna'da kadızâdelilerin meydana çıkmasını yazar, Amasyalı Vâiz adı altında zikrettiği bir kişinin şehre gelmesiyle ilişkilendirmektedir. Bu Vâiz, Saraybosna medresesinde müderrislik yapan ve "her bir vaazında sufileri, şeyhleri, kadıları, paşaları eleştiren" biriydi. Mecmuada yer alan birçok kayıt kadızâdeliler ile sufiler arasında doğrudan yaşanan çatışmalara tanıklık etmektedir. Saraybosna halkını yetenekleriyle eğlendirmek amacıyla şehre gelmiş olan cambazların gösterilerine kadızâdelilerin yirmi yıllık dönemde iki kez yasak koyduklarını belirten kayıtlar ise, kadızâdelilerin tüm cemaatin hayatını etkileme çabalarını ortaya koymaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Saraybosna, 18. yüzyıl, kadızâdeliler, sufiler

Introduction to the theme

In his *mecmua*, in which during fifty-odd years of the eighteenth century, recording various events and phenomena from everyday life in Sarajevo,[2] Mulla Mustafa Basheski wrote down in the Ottoman Turkish:

> *Zuhûr-ı müte'assıb ve binâ-yı medrese-i 'İnâdiyye. Ve bâ'is-i kâl. Ve fitne mâ-beyne'n-nâs olan Amasyalu, re'îs-i müte'assıb vâ'iz emîr, sene 1180.*

> *"Religious Puritans appeared and the Inadiya Madrasah was built. This gave ground for various rumours. The reason for stirring up contention among people is the leader of the Puritans, Vaiz of Amasia. The year: 1180."*[3]

As we see, the note is from 1180 of the Muslim calendar, which is 1766-1767 AD. Time denotation is its integral part, as of all other notes in this *mecmua*. This lends it a diary character, which makes Mulla Mustafa Basheski's *mecmua* fit the literary form which in the Ottoman culture, quite probably

---

[2] We gave an overview of contents about the Sarajevo everyday life recorded in that mecmua in the paper "Life in Sarajevo in the 18th Century (according to Mulla Mustafa's *mecmua*)" in the collected papers *Living in the Ottoman Ecumenical Community : Essays in Honour of Suraiya Faroqhi,* (Ed. Vera Constantini and Markus Koller), Brill, Leiden-Boston 2008, p. 317-345.

[3] 9a1-2. This is how we mark the number of a folio and line where the quoted note is in the original text of Basheski's mecmua that is kept in the manuscript Collection of the Gazi Husrev-bey library in Sarajevo under number 7340. We published the original text in the Latin transcription in the book entitled *XVIII. Yüzyıl Günlük Hayatına Dair Saraybosnalı Molla Mustafa'nın Mecmuası*, Connectum, Sarajevo 2011.

from the 16th century, was developed by sufi authors.[4] Its title also fits this since the author himself, Mulla Mustafa Basheski, called his diary *mecmua*.[5]

Focus of the information in the quoted note is on the appearance of religious Puritans in Sarajevo. Mulla Mustafa Basheski denoted them with the word *müteʿassıb*. Lexical meaning of that Arabic word is "a fanatic", "an enthusiast", "a devotee", and it comes from its verb participle form meaning "fanatic", "enthusiastic", "ecstatic", "enraptured". From this root is the verbal noun "te'assub" meaning "fanaticism", "excessive love for anything of one's own", "partiality", "persistence", "obstinacy".[6] Dictionary of the Ottoman language explains *müteʿassıb* as "the one who overemphasizes his side", "he who points out more than it is necessary his faith and confession, his customs, and who is, doing so, intolerant of the different".[7] Referential meaning of the word *müteʿassıb* used in Basheski's text are the citizens of Sarajevo who were recognized in social life of the City by the characteristics the word bears as its lexical meaning. Mulla Mustafa Basheski reports that the leader of that group of the Sarajevo citizens was a certain Vaiz of Amasia. His writing in the same passage about the construction of the Inadiya madrasah makes it clear that for the writer there is a certain link between the madrasah, Vaiz and religious Puritans (muteassibs).

Basheski did not mention the madrasah under the name of Inadiya any more in his *mecmua*, but he did mention Vaiz of Amasia in a number of notes. One of the notes reads:

> *"Emir of Amasia is a muderis at Bendbaša. The madrasah is located on the outskirts of the City, which is why he made efforts to appear as often as possible at pulpits [in the City's mosques] and deliver sermons. He talked in Turkish, loudly, shouting and making a noise. In each of his sermons he scolded sheiks, dervishes, tekkes, ćulahs,*[8] *kadis, dervish orders, and he was very skilful at it".*[9]

---

4 For sufi practice of diary keeping in Ottoman culture, see C. Kafadar, "Self and others: The diary of a dervish in seventeenth century Istanbul and first-person naratives in Ottoman Literature", *Studia Islamica*. LXIX, p. 128-129.

5 Derin Terzioğlu mentioned that also a large number of different titles given by Ottoman diary writers to their works, was one of the indicators of their "hybrid character" - such works are at the same time both histories and autobiographies. Among other things, they also used names *cerîde* and *mecmu'a*. See: "Man in the image of God in the image of the times: Sufi first-person narratives and the diary of Niyâzî-i Mısrî (1618–1694)", *Studia Islamica* 94, p. 148.

6 Teufik Muftić, *Arapsko-srpskohrvatski rječnik* II [Arabic-Serbo-Croatian Dictionary], Sarajevo 1973, p. 2265-2266.

7 Şemseddin Sami, *Kamûs-ı Türkî*, İkdam Matbaası. Der-saʿadet 1317, p. 1280.

8 Chulah (*çulah*): a woollen cap, usually white. Here mentioned as a feature of the sufi attire.

9 36a8-10.

The madrasah at Bendbaša was known to the local people under the name of Inadiya,[10] so that it is certain that it was in this madrasah that the muderis was the one named by Basheski in the previous note as Vaiz Emir of Amasia. His sermons, as described by Basheski, both by their content and the way in which Vaiz delivered them (shouting and making a noise) remind of those delivered by the leaders of the religious Puritan movement – the Kadizadelis in the Istanbul mosques in the 17th century.

Who was Vaiz of Amasia and why he came to Sarajevo are the questions without answers in Basheski's *mecmua*, but they are implied for at least two reasons. One is that Basheski, whenever he mentioned Vaiz of Amasia, had an objection to his scholarliness and behaviour. The other is that he related to Vaiz a group of the Sarajevo citizens with whom he expressed his disagreement.

Basheski and Vaiz of Amasia

Mulla Mustafa Basheski as a dervish certainly could not agree with the content of the sermons delivered by Vaiz of Amasia in the Sarajevo mosques. While Vaiz "scolded sheiks, dervishes, tekkes, chulahs and dervish orders", Basheski studied Islamic mysticism (*tasavvuf*) believing that, as he says in his *mecmua*, *"the outer knowledge cannot be understood without the inner knowledge, i.e. without tasavvuf, just as a bird cannot fly with one wing".* Basheski says about himself that he "thought and read day and night": *"And I did not find it difficult, until knowledge revealed itself to me and until I understood the essence of tasavvuf science. One night knowledge lit up to me. All books, as many as there are, on tasavvuf became clear to me, as they all merged into one essence. I understood, grasped everything, all clear and unclear (the outer and the inner) became clear to me".*[11]

It is absolutely certain that other Sarajevo citizens, inclined to Islamic mysticism, did not easily bear Vaiz's preaching from the pulpit either; however, Vaiz must have had enough audiences at his sermons because, as Basheski reports, *"for 14 solid years, since he had come, he scolded and spoke evil of all citizens of Sarajevo, of the Sheyhulislam, kazasker, pashas, ulema, sheiks, of good people who had lived before, of dervish orders".* [12.]

---

[10] The information that the Inadiya madrasah is at Bendbaša is taken from Mehmed Mujezinović's, *Mula Mustafa Ševki Bašeski–Ljetopis (1746-1804)*, Veselin Masleša, Sarajevo 1968, p. 97. It is mentioned under this name also by Ismet Kasumović in the book *Školstvo i obrazovanje u Bosanskom ejaletu za vrijeme osmanske uprave* [Education System in the Bosnian Eyalet during the Ottoman Administration], Islamski kulturni centar Mostar [Islamic Cultural Centre] 1999, p. 183-184.

[11] 36b18-37b5.

[12] 24b15-20.

Basheski wrote down this note in 1189 AH, i.e. in the summer of 1775AD, which leads us to the information that Vaiz came to Sarajevo in 1761 or 1762. We do not know where he served and how he acted in the first years of his stay in Sarajevo. One document which can be related to him is an order copied from a protocol (*şer'î sicil*) of the Sarajevo Sharia Court. By that order, as Mehmed Mujezinović established, "Abdullah Efendi of Amasia is appointed to the post of muderis at the madrasah at Bendbaša in Sarajevo, with a monthly salary of 30 akche (*akçe*) for the duty he had carried out free of charge". The order was dated to 2nd Ramadan 1180 (1st February 1767).[13] The date of issue of the order, as we see, corresponds with the time when Basheski mentioned Vaiz and Inadiya madrasah for the first time in his *mecmua*. Abdullah-efendi of Amasia could have been Basheski's Vaiz of Amasia.

By 1767, when the order fixed his employment and salary, Vaiz had certainly won, through his activity, his followers in Sarajevo, as Basheski calls him leader (*re'îs*) and those who followed him religious Puritans (muteassibs). It is likely that in those years, at least from 1766 to1767 when Basheski recorded that *zuhûr-ı mute'assıb*, the presence of the religious Puritans was felt in the City's social life.

A clash in a mosque between the sufis and muteassibs

The Puritans' influence on the religious and social life in Sarajevo must have continued to grow in the years that followed, which is indicated by Mulla Mustafa Basheski's direct comments, as well as by an event he recorded. That is a quarrel which grew into a fight between muteassibs and sufis in a Sarajevo mosque. The quarrel was caused, in Basheski's words, by the fact that dervish Mustafa Mlivar, appointed as the Mevlevi sufi order sheik by the mulla, started to hold the sufi rite (dhikr – the recollection of God) at the Tabačka Mosque, where he carried out the duty of muezzin on a voluntary basis. At that same mosque, the duty of the imam was discharged, according to Basheski, *"by the brother of the greatest muteassib"* (*ve en büyük müteʻassıbuŋ karındaşı câmiʻ-i mezbûrede imâm iken*).

"One day", Basheski recorded the event, *"several muteassibs came, the more determined and louder ones"* (yaramazlar) *to prevent the holding of the dhikr in that mosque. But, there came also a few men inclined to the dervishes with the intention to participate in the dhikr after the asr prayer. A row broke out in the mosque. Muteassibs say 'we won't let you do it', the dervishes say 'you shall'. The row grew into a fight, they started with punching* (yaramazlar da vermeziz, verürsüŋüz deyerek câmiʻinüŋ içinde yumruk yumruga, birbirisini ura ura). *Finally, elhamdulillah, the dervishes won. Later, the imam was*

---

[13] Mehmed Mujezinović, *Mula Mustafa Ševki Bašeskija–Ljetopis (1746–1804)*, p. 97.

removed from his duty, the bullies stopped coming and making rows (yaramaz münkirler dahi gavgaya andan soŋra gelmez olurlar), *while the dervishes continued holding the dhikr every day after the asr prayer. This is how the Sublime Creator manifested His Power. The said sheik is a frail old man, calm and quiet, but he and his side came as winners out of this clash which happened in the heart of the City, at the time when the religious Puritans assumed the highest superiority. Thus, with the Sublime Creator's order, the sheik compared to the Puritans like a fly to Nemrud."*[14]

This note, written down by Mulla Mustafa Basheski in 1771 (1184 AH), shows that at that time, among the Muslim believers, there were two factions. One was dervishes, or the believers who perceived Islam through the teaching of tasavvuf, and the other was orthodoxly oriented believers. The clash at the Tabačka Mosque in Sarajevo reminds of another clash that happened some 80 years before in Bursa. In the Bursa Ulu Mosque, on the 27th night of the month of Ramadan (1692), religious Puritans clashed with the followers of Niyâzî-i Misrî, the learned sufi of the time.[15] The Bursa and Sarajevo incidents are alike in that each fight took place in a mosque between two believer factions.

The cause of the row at the Tabačka Mosque in Sarajevo was probably the struggle for the mosque space. The Sarajevo Puritans claimed the right to the mosque where one of them was imam and they were against the holding of the dervish ritual (dhikr) in that space. Whether the muezzin, having become the Mevlevi sheik, wanted to hold the dhikr in the mosque because that space was indeed the most suitable, or may he also have claimed, together with the dervishes, the right to the mosque? Mosques offered to sufis, as well as to the religious Puritans, a possibility to obtain new adherents. As the presence in mosques in Istanbul in the previous century "brought additional status and legitimacy to sufis, as well considerable audiences",[16] similar reasons might have also inspired the Mevlevi brotherhood in Sarajevo to come together in the mosque. Be as it may, this case shows that in Sarajevo between the Puritans and sufis there was not only opposition in terms of perceiving the faith but also rivalry over the sacred space.

Mulla Mustafa Basheski expressed his attitude to the Tabačka Mosque event with the words of thanks to God (*elhamdulillah*) "that eventually the dervishes won" and he went on to comment on the event by comparison alluding to the story of the ruler Nemerud and the fly which caused his death.

---

[14] 16b10-23.

[15] This event was mentioned by Semiramis Çavuşoğlu in the headword "Kadızâdeliler", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*, XXIV, Istanbul 2001, p. 102.

[16] Madeline C. Zilfi, "The Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul", *The Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, Vol. 45, p. 268.

The ruler refused to accept the invitation of Prophet Ibrahim to believe in one God and he proclaimed himself, relying on the great power he had, a deity demanding of his subjects to treat him as one. God punished Nemerud for his arrogance by sending an ordinary fly which caused his death, so that a powerful ruler fell as a fly victim by God's injunction. In Basheski's comparison, the Puritans are like Nemrud, and the Mevlevi sheik like the fly. Comparing the Puritans to Nemerud, Basheski shows that he sees their behaviour in the City as arrogant, rough-mannered and violent.

The authorities had to react to the fight at the Tabačka Mosque. The Mosque imam was dismissed. We do not know whether the authorities took any measures against the Puritans, but Basheski says that *"they didn't come back any more to raise rows and the dervishes continued holding dhikr every day."*

Vaiz's banishment from Sarajevo

We learn from Mulla Mustafa Basheski's notes how relationships developed between the sufis and muteassibs in the years to come, and there are no other sources to witness of that aspect of social life in Sarajevo. However, four years after the event at the Tabačka Mosque, Basheski wrote down that the authorities had exiled Vaiz from Sarajevo:

> *"Three days before Alijun / St. Elias' Day*[17] *there came* telli-çavuş, *captured at twilight on the street muteassib Vaiz* (müteʻassıbı vâʻizi ahşam üsti sokakda kapup) *and the same night brought him in before the muteselim. On Friday dawn he sent him into exile to Amasia."*

That happened in 1189 AH or in the summer of 1775. Having noted the event itself, Mulla Mustafa Basheski added his remark about why Vaiz had been exiled:

> *"Vaiz's guilt was in that, for 14 full years since he had come, while delivering sermons from the pulpit, he scolded and spoke evil of all Sarajevo citizens, of Seyhulislam, kazasker, pashas, ulema, sheiks, of good people who had lived before, of the dervish orders. That is why that misfortune struck him.* [18]

Vaiz also, like preachers in Istanbul, may have "succeeded in reshaping things that should fall within academic domain into the issues related to policies of the Empire".[19] In any case, we have only Basheski's account in the above

---

[17] In folk time reckoning, Alijun/St. Elias' Day is the turning point of summer. It falls on the 2nd of August.

[18] 24b15-20.

[19] Madeline C. Zilfi, "The Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul" p. 256.

note about the reasons for his banishment. The note once again shows that Vaiz could have stayed in Sarajevo from the early 1760s. Among the adherents he obtained over the 14 years of his stay in Sarajevo, there certainly were influential and rich people, as some of them, in Mulla Mustafa Basheski's words, took all measures to prevent this man's banishment.

> *"Some of his [Vaiz's] followers, otherwise ignorant persons, talked* kolçehaya *into making a mahzar. Indeed, several leading men and Vaiz'z followers made a mahzar saying that allegedly all citizens are satisfied with him* (gûyâ yek-pâre şehir halkı bâ-cem'ihim andan hoşnûd oldıgını mahzarda tahrîr). *And that was a downright lie* (Ve kizb-i sarīh). *Kadi-efendis took the mahzar unstamped to the pasha in Travnik. On top of that, the mahzar submitters promised to give the* kolçehaya *20 okka of coffee and 10 okka to the mulla for affixing the seal. They also got some leading men to intervene about the seal affixing. Having received the mahzar, the pasha did not send his man, only a letter. Then the Kadizadelis, emirites allegedly gave 150* guruş *to the mulla's* çohadâr *to take the mahzar to Istanbul."*[20]

Vaiz's supporters: the Kadizadelis-emirites

Mulla Mustafa Basheski directly names the people who intervened on behalf of Vaiz the Kadizadelis, juxtaposing the other name – „emirites". Clearly, the Turkish name „Kadizadeli" is formed by adding the suffix *–li* to the proper name Kadizade, so that the coined word denotes a follower of a teaching, social order, idea.[21] As for the Bosnian name "emirovac", it is derived from the noun "emir" by means of the compound suffix *–ovac*. Precisely, it is the suffix *–ov* forming adjectives and the suffix *–ac* deriving nouns from adjectives meaning the adherent to a teaching, attitude, idea, or social order contained in the derivational basis ("emir"). The formation of this word was made even easier as the word "emir" was transferred from Turkish into Bosnian so that "emirovac" fits perfectly the system of the Bosnian language. In the Turkish text, the author got the meaning of the plural simply by adding the Turkish plural suffix *–lar* to the "Bosnian" derivative (*emir-ov-ac-lar*). Mulla Mustafa Basheski seems to have wanted, by juxtaposing the Bosnian name with the Turkish one, otherwise well-known and at the time widespread for the members of a certain social movement in the Ottoman state, to name precisely the Bosnian Kadizadelis as supporters of the emir. The name "emirovac – emirate" is used in three more notes in Basheski's *mecmua*, each time as a denotation of social orientation of the person referred to in the note.

---

[20] 25a1-6.

[21] Hamza Zülfikar, *Terim Sorunları ve Terim Yapma Yolları*, Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara 1991, p. 108-109.

So the function of the word is perfectly clear in the following example where it occurs, like in the example above, juxtaposed with the noun "Kadizadeli".

Kunooglı sofî, kâdîzâdeli emirovaç, seferde...

Kunogli, who was a pious man, a Kazidazeli, an emirate, was killed in a war.

In the other two examples, the Bosnian name was enough; it was not accompanied with the Turkish one:

Emirovaç, sarı sakallı. (The yellow-bearded emirite died.) *Ve Muharremî kâdîniñ dâmâdı el-Hâcc ʿOsmân hasbî sefere gidüp seferde aga olup bayrakdârı Uzun İbrâhîm emirovaç olmışdur*. (*Hajji Osman, son-in-law of kadi Muharremi went to war of his own free will and became aga, while Uzun Ibrahim, an emirite, became his ensign*.)[22]

Why does Basheski call them emir's followers?

In most of the notes where he speaks about Vaiz of Amasia, Basheski also calls him emir. Here are some examples: *Amasyalu re'îs-i müteʿassıb vâʿiz emir*. Here Amasyali is Vaiz's first designation, then there follows the determinant Puritan leader, and then that he was a vaiz, and eventually emir. In the note *Emir Amasyalı, Bendbaşa'da medresede müderris* where we read that he is a muderis at the Bandbaša madrasah, Vaiz was named only as Emir of Amasia. Further, in a note that we will comment on in more detail in the text below, with the noun vaiz there is also the noun emir (*Emir Vâʿiz ʿarz almak içün mollâya gitmiş*).[23] Vaiz is emir also in the note about his banishment from Sarajevo. (*Emir müteʿassıbı Vâʿizi ahşam üsti sokakda kapup*). Obviously, emir is another designation of Vaiz.

Vaiz, however, is not the only emir in Basheski's book. The title is found with the names of some other Sarajevo citizens, among whom there are learned people, craftsmen, affluent individuals and indigent people. An indigent, for example, was the old man Ismail-baša, a chestnut seller. *"When he died, they put a green turban on his coffin because he was an emir, the fact unknown of him before.*"[24] This note indicates the link between the title of "emir" and the green turban.

The green turban marks a member of the Prophet Muhamed's descent, i.e. descendents of the Prophet's grandsons Hassan and Hussein. They wore special clothes consisting of a green mantle (*cubbe*) and a turban *(saruk)* of green fabric

[22] These notes in mecmua are on the following folios: 70b21, 70b29, 17b14.
[23] 16b11.
[24] 97a2.

on the head. The green turban worn by the descendents of the Prophet's grandsons –seyyids– was called *emîr sarugı* (emir's turban) by the Ottomans. Emir is a title of honour denoting the belonging to noble parentage, and calling the green turban of the seyyids as "emir's turban" could be related to Emîr Sultan through whom the Ottomans express their relationship to the Prophet's parentage.[25]

The French traveler Poullet, in the mid-seventeenth century, among his impressions of Bosnia, wrote down in his travel book that the green turban on the shroud was a symbol of the Prophet's descendants.[26] Obviously, this is the custom mentioned in Basheski's note about Ismail-baša.

In Basheski's *mecmua*, we come across the title of emir with the Sarajevo mufti Mehmed-efendi Svraka. Basheski recorded that mufti Svraka was "*emir*" and "*čelebi*" (*emîr çelebi müftî, Svrakiç demekle ma'rûf*). At another place, he calls him "*our mufti Svrako, Seyyid Mehmed-efendi*" (*müftîmüz Svrakoogli es-Seyyid Mehmed Efendi*).[27] This way of addressing makes it clear that the titles of emir and seyyid refer to the same man.

The Gazi Husrev-bey Library in Sarajevo keeps a diploma (*icâzetnâme*), issued in Istanbul in 1766 in the name of Seyyid 'Abdullah-efendi Al-Amasî. In the diploma holder's name, seyyid is, most certainly, a designation of Abdullah's relationship with the Prophet's lineage.[28] Abdullah-efendi's second name is Al-Amasî. This could be a diploma of Basheski's Vaiz of Amasia. The year of the diploma issue corresponds to the year when Basheski recorded the construction of the Inadiya madrasah. If this is indeed Vaiz of Amasia's diploma, then it is certain that he was a seyyid and that the title of emir could mean his relationship with the Prophet's parentage.

Interestingly, Mulla Mustafa Basheski nowhere in his *mecmua* noted the proper name of Vaiz of Amasia. It is unlikely that he did not know the name of the vaiz who lived in Sarajevo for many years. On the other hand, he

---

[25] Emir Sultan, or Emir Efendi was born in Bukhara in a seyyid family. His name is Muhammed bin Ali Şemsuddin. Having visited several countries and towns, he reached Bursa. There he married Hundî Hatun, daughter of Sultan Bayezid Yildirim. When he became Sultan's son-in-law, he acquired the name of Emir Sultan and was appointed representative of the Prophet's descendents (*şerîfs* and *seyyids*).

[26] Fehim Nametak, "Institucija nekibu-l-ešrafa u Bosni i Hercegovini" [Nekibu-l-ešraf Institution in Bosnia and Herzegovina], *Anali Gazi Husrev-begove biblioteke*, 17–18, Sarajevo 1996, p. 253.

[27] Notes on Mehmed Svraka are on folios 36a23 and 93b1.

[28] Haso Popara, "Idžazetname u rukopisima Gazi Husrev-begove biblioteke–Prilog proučavanju historije obrazovanja u BiH", *Anali Gazi Husrev-begove biblioteke* 25–26, Sarajevo 2007, p. 17.

mentioned him nowhere only as Amasyalı. This shows that for Mulla Mustafa Basheski he primarily was a vaiz. Actually, Basheski used a common noun as his name. Certainly, this Basheski's procedure was possible since Turkish, like many other languages, allows for a coinage (a common noun) to reshape by permutation into an idionym (personal name).

Vaiz of Amasia as mufti

In the year 1775 when he was exiled, Vaiz was absent only for a short time from Sarajevo. On 10th October the same year, about two months after *telli-çavuş* had taken Vaiz from Sarajevo, Basheski recorded: *Ve mezbûr nefy olunan müte'assıb emîr dahi geldi fî-1189 fî-15 ş.* (*"There came the expelled emir muteassib*".)[29]

Basheski wrote down nothing about the circumstances under which the event developed outside Sarajevo as he probably did not know anything about it. Vaiz may have benefitted from the mahzar which his followers sent to Istanbul through mulla's *çohadâr* and who (the followers) paid him 150 *guruş* for the service, as we read in the note above. Be as it may, Vaiz must have counted on some support in Sarajevo when, soon after his return, he asked the post of a mufti. By Basheski's account, he really became a mufti:

> *"Vaiz, that muteassib and munkir, out of spite and encouraged by some of his supporters, who are also spiteful, submitted a request to the mulla to appoint him as mufti. Mulla affixed the seal on his mahzar and they [Vaiz and his followers] gave him a lot of money for that (*vâfir akçe*) which they had pre-collected. But as in Istanbul, too, there are people greedy for money, he obtained the requested post, and the appointment was sent directly to him. The mulla's* çohadâr *did this for him (*ve mollânuŋ çukadârı yapdurmış getürmiş*). But as he was an ordinary ignoramus, he got absolutely lost in mufti's position. Many queries piled up, but he was not able to answer any one of them. Thus lost, he issued some helter-skelter (*yangur yungur*) legal advice; besides that, he wrote absolutely badly. This is why some people, in mosques and various secluded places, started to leave secretly letters reading:* Ey müftî câhil ebter, rüsvây-ı 'âlem oldun beter, imâna gel artuk yeter *(Mufti, you ignorant, enough of that! Shame on you! Return to faith after all.)*"[30]

If Basheski's words are true about the circumstances in which Vaiz became mufti – and in a note in the *mecmua* he pledged his word to register events only when he was convinced that he knew the truth[31] - then in the

[29] 25b18.
[30] 26a15-26b3.
[31] 13a20.

quoted note we read about corruption of authority representatives and about the citizens who wanted to realize their wishes through bribery; about the fact that people followed Vaiz not only because they shared his opinion about religious issues but also for the aspirations to ensure some influence for themselves; about Vaiz's boldness to require mufti's post which he was incapable to carry out, and eventually about easily obtained appointment to the office; responsibility for that is not only with the local authorities but with the authorities in the capital as well.

Mulla Mustafa Basheski in two other notes wrote about Vaiz as an incompetent mufti who issued ill-founded legal advice: *Fetvâlar yangur yungur olmagile ʿazl olundı.* [32] *Ve cehl açuk oldı, ve ʿazl oldı.*[33] In addition to the quoted sentences, the writer in both instances wrote down something else – that after such experience, the mufti withdrew from the city's public life. Here is the note made on the occasion of Vaiz's death.

> "*He went to Makkah as a substitute where he stayed for some time. On the way back, he stopped in Amasia and he died there. He did not like dervishes. He was absolutely ignorant of both science and writing. However, ordinary people did not know that when he had first come as, they say, anything new is attractive. The People acknowledged him so that he managed to raise money and build a new madrasah at Bendbaša. They made him a real Karun.*[34] *For some fifteen years he kept going to the pulpit where he attacked the sufis, plotted and scolded. Finally they expelled him once, but he returned. Then they appointed him mufti* (*müftî etdürdiler*), *when his ignorance became evident and he was dismissed. So people, ordinary people stopped recognizing him. There he died and that was the end to his life.*"[35]

After he was removed from mufti's office, we do not see Vaiz any more at pulpits in the Sarajevo mosques. Actually, after that event, Basheski did not mention Vaiz again in his *mecmua* until the news about his death came. For those ten years, from the time when he was mufti to his death, Vaiz probably was not influential any more in the matters of religion as he had been earlier. He may have continued working as muderis at the Inadiya Madrasah at Bendbaša which was established, as the last note has it, with his dedication.

---

[32] 36a14
[33] 97b18.
[34] Mulla Mustafa Basheski here uses another comparison. He compares Vaiz to Karun who first accepted the Prophet Musa's call and believed in one God, but over time, becoming richer and richer, he departed from faith and lived as an atheist/unbeliever until by God's order he met with an accident together with his immense wealth.
[35] 97b13-18.

Two denominational factions in the City

Vaiz, during those fifteen odd years of his activities at the Sarajevo pulpits, probably knew how to approach people. Judging by Mulla Mustafa Basheski's notes, among the citizens of Sarajevo at that time there were those who followed the Kadizadelis and those who followed the dervishes. That the division characterised the life in the City we can conclude from the fact that Basheski, recording in his *mecmua* the death of fellow-townsmen, which was his regular practice, would add, here and there, to the deceased's name *kâdızâdeli* or *dervîş*, or he would indicate that the deceased was a fan of the former or the latter. Here are a few notes randomly selected:

> *Young Mostić joined the Kadizadeli order; he is slim, rich, but life did not spare him.*
>
> *Kabadaja [was] aged 90. He owned many shops in Sarajevo, more than 40. A wealthy man. He behaved as a Kadizadeli.*
>
> *Mustafa Gušo, a coffin-maker, an old man. He loved the Kadizadelis.*
>
> *Kadi Osman-efendi, an old man. He loved the dervishes.*
>
> *Dervish Ahmed, a cook at the public charity kitchen; he always wore a ćulah and hrka. He wore that dervish outfit until his death.*
>
> *Mulla Hasan, a clothier, son of hajji Mustafa; he loved the dervishes. He was insightful, understood astronomy to some extent. He was killed at Bucharest. He was a good friend of mine. May God's mercy be upon him! We are not certain, but he may be alive in captivity.*[36]

At places in *mecmua* we come across, although very seldom, some notes informing us that a citizen changed the side. Thus "*hajji Mehmed Ćomara, otherwise a merchant who travelled a lot, became a Kadizedeli while before that he regularly came to the tekke and participated in reciting the evrâd.*"[37] Basheski does not discuss what the reason might be for Ćomara hajji Mehmed's change, just as he does not record what made other people opt for a denominational practice recommended by the Kadizadelis, or by the sufis. Those certainly may have been specific life situations, like in the case of a clothier, son of the cook Ali. He "*blindly followed muteassib Vaiz, often did various foolish things and exaggerated so grossly interfering with people's faith that people talked about it. When he fell ill, he felt sorry for that. They say that he sent water to the tekke for cure over which the sheik said a prayer and blew into it.*[38]

---

[36] The notes above are successively quoted on folios: 141b16; 135a16; 73b25; 72b1; 98a12; 71a9.
[37] 127b23.
[38] 96a1-3.

Kadizadelis' influence on life in the City

How some of the Kadizadelis, like the clothier mentioned above, interfered with people's faith can be seen from a case that happened in 1782. A Kadizadeli assaulted a sufi on the street. Fortunately, the clash did not grow into a fight like the one at the Tabačka Mosque. The note reads:

> *"Vejs, son of the sheik in the Hajji Sinan tekke, died. While we were carrying him to the mosque, the Mevlevi skeik Osman-dede walked at the front of the funeral procession, reciting the tevhîd. When the cortège reached Sarači Street, where a large number of people had already joined, a noise broke out at the front of the procession. It was muteassib mulla Omer Putimrak, always with sullen face and untrimmed beard, otherwise imam at the Kebkebir quarter, assaulted sheik Osman, yelling:"Why are you shouting, you novelty fan* (ehl-i bid'at)*." Sheik Osman instantly grabbed him by the beard and struck him down, grabbing also Ali-baša Skender's beard. The people began to say invocations of blessings upon the Prophet and so went on scolding the Kadizadelis as far as Baščaršija square and so overwhelmed them."* (*Muhammed'e salavât halk, mezbûr-ı kâdîzâdeleri Başçârşû'ya dek sögerek gitdiler, fevz oldılar.*)[39]

That time the clash went beyond the limits of the sacred space and brought out onto the streets the disagreement about religious practice. Assault during the funeral, judging by its easy stopping, certainly had not been prearranged by the Kadizadelis but rather a spontaneous reaction of one or two among them.

In Basheski's words, Sheik Mehmed, head of the Sinan tekke, was often a target of verbal assault by Kadizadelis. His reaction to the assaults was instructive telling and patience:

> *"The Kadizadelis attacked him bitterly with sharp words, but that did not touch his heart, he did not answer with scolding but rather spoke that 'passions are seductive'. He knew how to express through a story in the figurative sense his dislike for improper behaviour."*[40]

Basheski's notes create an impression that the Kadizadelis in Sarajevo acted in the way making the believers undecided for either of the factions feel their presence. Actually, their public activity was not targeted only at the sufis. The way they interpreted faith often took them so far that, with promoting their attitude to the forbidding of certain social habits, they determined lives of

[39] 41b25-42a4.

[40] 81a4.

all the populace in the City.[41] Basheski writes outright about the Kadizadelis' attitude to the acrobats who arrived in the City with the aim to entertain the people, performing their skills. Acrobats were a popular entertainment in the whole Empire, but when their troupe arrived in Sarajevo in 1779 "ten days upon Alijun/St. Elias' Day",[42] the Kadizadelis did not let them perform. Here is Mulla Mustafa Basheski's description of the event:

> "*Acrobats arrived. But, some Kadizadelis of our city, presenting themselves like devotees and speaking like devotees, while in their soul they are real mischief-makers, went to the authorities and so the acrobats were not granted permission. Sarajevo is a city where there are Kadizadelis who would not listen to the Prophet if He Himself allowed it, but they would go on with their spite. The acrobats eventually went to Visoko followed by many Sarajevans to watch them".*[43]

Nineteen years later on, in the summer of 1798, the situation with acrobats repeated itself:

> *"Acrobats came, but their performance was spoilt by two or three Kadizadelis; they were not allowed to perform. The acrobats went to Visoko, a lot of people from the city went there to watch them. Those who did not give the acrobats permission gave so many people (ibâdullah) a rough time. The Kadizadelis give no ease, only problems."*[44]

Both notes tell that the acrobat incidents in Sarajevo were provoked by the Kadizadelis' intervention with the local authorities. The notes, actually, show that the Kadizadelis managed to have impact on the social and political life in Sarajevo in the same way for at least 20 years in the 18th century. We read about Kadizadelis' influence on the local authorities also in the note on Vaiz's appointment as mufti. On that occasion, Basheski mentioned the greed for money among "people in Istanbul". It suffices to read in the note about Vaiz's death that *"they proclaimed him mufti"* (i.e. *"made him mufti"*) (*müfti etdürdiler*), whence we can understand that the circumstances were in favour of Vaiz's promotion to that position as much as his own strength of purpose.

The fact that on both occasions when their performances were banned in Sarajevo the acrobats went to Visoko shows that the Kadizadelis did not act (at least not in the same way) in the town which is some thirty kilometres away from Sarajevo. Even at Basheski's time that distance was not considered long if

---

41 Earlier as well the Kadizadelis in Istanbul were more successful in forbidding social customs than sufi rituals; they banned coffee, tobacco, wine. Cf. Madeline C. Zilfi, "The Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul", p. 257.

42 35a9.

43 35a6-9; 35a12-13.

44 154a18-20.

people could cover it only for fun. This circumstance is, at least to some extent, reminiscent of the circumstances in the centre of the Empire one century before, as the Kadizadelis then also acted right in the capital, in Istanbul.

Mulla Mustafa Basheski and the Kadizadelis

In his last notes, Mulla Mustafa Basheski's sharp comments on the Kadizadelis' beliefs draw attention. As a believer, Basheski must have had a serious reason to judge on souls of other people, to accuse the Kadizadelis with a hypothetical sentence that they would not obey even the Prophet, or to call them "munkir". A munkir is he who denies the truth, and he who does not believe. In fact, in some of his notes, Basheski called Vaiz of Amasia munkir and muteassib, and the content of the following note makes it clear that, in his language, munkirs are those who do not like dervishes:

> "*Mehmed-Pasha Muhsinzâde, who discharges the duty of Bosnian vizier, sent a letter and 500* guruş *for the rehabilitation of the Hajji Sinan tekke. Munkirs ate their hearts out. In rebîulevvel 1188.*"[45]

Two bans on acrobats' performing in Sarajevo reveal the nature of fanatic religious activity practiced through bans. The Kadizadelis indeed undermined entertainment in Sarajevo, but they, however, could not forbid the people to have fun; the people went to Visoko to watch the acrobats. So, acting through bans produced a poor result as the wanted change took place only "on the surface", while nothing essentially changed in the citizens' behaviour. Could this have been the reason why Mulla Mustafa Basheski dared to talk in his comments about the state of mind of some Kadizadelis?

Basheski (as a Muslim believer) certainly held to the Qur'anic words recommending to believers to advise one another about what is proper/right and to avert from the improper/wrong: *Emr-i bi'l-ma'rûf ve nehy-i ani'l-münker*.[46] It is on these Qur'anic sentences that the Kadizadelis founded their activity through bans and orders. But what should precede that activity is the explaining of what is and is not right according to religion. Interpretation

---

[45] 23a5-7. That was in May-June 1774, or at the time when, according to Basheski's notes, the Kadizadelis' presence in the City was strongly felt. This Basheski's note reminds a lot of another note written down in the previous century by a well-known sufi teacher Nijazî-i Misrî: *"Late in ten seventy-one"*,[45] Misrî wrote down, "*I was forced to leave Uşak and move to Bursa. Munkirs' intention was to pull down tekkes and build madrasahs instead.*" As we can see, Basheski and Misrî use the same phrases when writing – for both of them the religious Puritans are *munkirs*. The note from Misrî's mecmua taken from: Mustafa Aşkar, "Tarikat-Devlet İlişkisi, Kadızâdeli ve Meşâyıh Tartışmaları Açısından Niyazî-i Mısrî ve Döneme Etkileri", *Tasavvuf – İlmi ve Akademik Araştırma Dergisi*, Sayı 1, Ankara 1999, p. 63.

[46] Kur'an: 3/104, 9/71/112, 11/116.

means reflexion and taking responsibility, which is much more than merely imposing bans, or order giving.

Basheski is aware that interpretation of faith also affects believers' attitudes towards the society in which they live. Accepting one practice of faith, one determines both his life and his attitude to society. Basheski, being a believer, did not let himself be uninterested in the issues of social life. His care about the community to which he belonged made him write about the Kadizadelis. When he criticises those people, he does not talk about them as individuals, he does not name them personally, but he mentions them as members of the community. His reproach is that they *"make it more difficult for the people instead of making it easier"*, claiming that thus they want to come closer to God. How, then, did the Kadizadelis obtain support from the populace?

People and the Kadizadelis

Vaiz knew, beyond a doubt, how to adjust his public address from the pulpit to the values of the audiences. Basheski's words that Vaiz was a complete ignoramus should not be understood literally. Basheski probably under the word "ignoramus" meant that Vaiz's interpretation of faith was literal. Here is his comment on the sermons of another Sarajevo scholar who, like Vaiz of Amasia, liked preaching from the pulpit:

> *"Hajji Mehmed-efendi from Čajniče was muderis at the Đumišića Madrasah. But, as he was from the inland, he did not have urban conduct. He was familiar with logic and prose writing (description). He was not ignorant in other sciences either. However, as the chief vaiz, he had no knowledge of Turkish and Persian, of poetry and law of succession. All he did was talking about what he had seen in Arabia. There was a shade of exaltation in him. He lectured and preached to ordinary people. If an educated person listened to him, his stomach would churn of abhorrence, but people gladly listened to his lectures. As people have no common sense, they began to praise him as an excellent scholar and preferred him to those who really are learned."*[47]

When you read this Basheski's note, you remember the situation in Istanbul in the 17th century and the factors that contributed to the popularity of the Kadizadelis with people. At the time of advancement of religious fanaticism in Sarajevo, the Ottoman state was waging wars at a number of fronts in which, according to Mulla Mustafa Basheski's accounts, Bosnians also participated. There were campaigns at the eastern front against Russia, against Austria, but there were also "small wars" unrecorded by "the great histories", such as the war in Monte Negro in 1768.

[47] 36a15-20.

The last cited Basheski's note, like some others in his *mecmua*, tells indirectly of the role of the learned men in the community. Here is his comment on Mehmed Čajničanin, just mentioned above, in another note in *mecmua*:

> *"In our city there is hajji Mehmed-efendi Čajno who teaches grammar of Arabic to some Kadizadelis. But what does he teach them? How the verb* nasare nasara *is conjugated. People, small shopkeepers, with a few merchants among them as well, think this is science*."[48]

If the Istanbulans listened to preachers because, as Katib Çelebi says, "they were hell-deep in ignorance",[49] and if the Sarajevans "preferred Mehmed-efendi Čajničanin to the really learned men", then the ulema must have neglected their role in the society - to offer people, through preaching or some other religious practice, the necessary religious education and help them with spiritual enlightenment.

Conclusion

Notes in which Mulla Mustafa Basheski mentions the presence of religious Puritans (muteassib) in Sarajevo are recorded on various folios in his *mecmua* which he wrote in the diary form, regularly writing the date of the event recorded in his note. Thus he wrote about the Puritans when they drew attention to themselves in the City's religious and/or social life. Correlating the content of those notes showed that the presence of muteassibs in Sarajevo was felt from the 1760s. In Mulla Mustafa Basheski's words, religious fanaticism was induced by the arrival of a preacher (vaiz) of Amasia who got the job of muderis in a newly-built madrasah.

Vaiz of Amasia and his followers whom he won over during some fifteen years of his public activity in Sarajevo are expressly called Kadizadelis by Mulla Mustafa Basheski. Their activity, seen through Basheski's account, reminds of the Kadizadelis' activity in Istanbul in the 17th century. The similarity is the particularity observable in the strongly manifested wish of the Kadizadelis to address people from the mosque pulpits, as well as in their efforts to determine values for the whole community. So we read in Basheski's *mecmua* that on two occasions in Sarajevo the Kadizadelis, with their influence on the local authorities, succeeded in banning performances of the acrobats who came to entertain people. That happened first in 1779, and then again in 1798. Tracing the dates of notes mentioning religious Puritans, we can see that they were active in Sarajevo in the second half of the 18th century.

---

[48] 42a8-10.

[49] Madeline C. Zilfi, "The Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul", p. 253.

Mulla Mustafa Basheski's *мecmua* classifies him into the sufis who, as a form of their spiritual practice, kept diaries. The notes in the diary have versatile content; however, many of them have a common characteristic – they are the writer's reaction to social phenomena. Writing about social events, he reassessed his faith and identification. His comments on the Kadizadelis are examples of such practice.

Bibliography

AŞKAR, Mustafa, "Tarikat–Devlet İlişkisi, Kadızâdeli ve Meşâyıh Tartışmaları Açısından Niyazī-i Mısrī ve Döneme Etkileri", *Tasavvuf-İlmi ve Akademik Araştırma Dergisi*, Sayı 1, 1999, p. 49-80.

ÇAVUŞOĞLU, Semiramis, "Kadızâdeliler", *Türkiye Diyanet Vakfı İslam Ansiklopedisi*. Vol. 24, İstanbul 2001, p. 100–102.

FILAN, Kerima, "Life in Sarajevo in the 18th Century (according to Mulla Mustafa's *mecmua*)" u zborniku *Living in the Ottoman Ecumenical Community: Essays in Honour of Suraiya Faroqhi,* (Ed. Vera Constantini and Markus Kolleri, Brill-Leiden-Boston 2008, p. 317-345.

FILAN, Kerima, "Sufije i kadizadelije u osmanskom Sarajevu", *Anali Gazi Husrev-begove biblioteke* 29-30, Sarajevo 2009, p. 163-186.

FILAN, Kerima, *XVIII. Yüzyıl Günlük Hayatına Dair Saraybosnalı Molla Mustafa'nın Mecmuası*, Connectum, Sarajevo 2011.

KAFADAR, Cemal, "Self and others: The diary of a dervish in seventeenth century Istanbul and first-person naratives in Ottoman Literature", *Studia Islamica*, LXIX, 1989, p. 121–150.

KASUMOVIĆ, Ismet, *Školstvo i obrazovanje u Bosanskom ejaletu za vrijeme osmanske uprave,* Islamski kulturni centar, Mostar 1999.

MUFTIĆ, Teufik, *Arapsko-srpskohrvatski rječnik* I-II, Sarajevo 1973.

MUJEZINOVIĆ, Mehmed, (Prijevod, uvod i komentar), *Mula Mustafa Ševki Bašeskija – Ljetopis (1746–1804)*, Veselin Masleša, Sarajevo 1968.

NAMETAK, Fehim, "Institucija nekibu-l-ešrafa u Bosni i Hercegovini", *Anali Gazi Husrev-begove biblioteke,* 17–18, 1996, p. 253–257.

POPARA, Haso, " the diary of Niyâzî-i Mısrî (1618–1694)", *Studia Islamica,* 94, 2002, p. 139–165.

ZILFI, Madeline C.,"The Kadizadelis: Discordant Revivalism in Seventeenth-Century Istanbul" *The Journal of Near Eastern Studies,* 45, 1986, p. 251–274.

ZÜLFİKAR, Hamza, *Terim Sorunları ve Terim Yapma Yolları*, Türk Dil Kurumu Yayınları, Ankara 1991.